



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

X—XI

In these two articles Krause discussed the question of the capital to be chosen and the language to be used for the common needs of the proposed League. Under the circumstances existing a hundred years ago, Berlin and the German language seemed to be most convenient agencies for serving these needs.

Dr. MacCauley adds this note:

In the magazine *Die Neue Zeit* (*The New Age*), a quarterly published in Prague, Bohemia, in the year 1873, where I found the extraordinarily timely essay, from which I have drawn the articles here published, by courtesy of *The Japan Advertiser*, there is an editorial note to this effect:

"This proposition of Krause's is not given as an absolutely ideal offering for securing the right intercourse of the world's nations; but it does bear upon the present (1873) unjust conditions prevalent among the peoples of Europe. Krause did not undertake the impossibility in his age of wholly setting aside war, but only to advance the possibility for the nations, in most cases, to avoid war.

"However, this proposal is fully ideal, so far as it puts forward and holds fast the principle that right should go before might; that, absolutely, might may not be made coincident with right in that the just State is summoned to protect the weak. Krause's proposal is, also, ideal in that it is directed toward the ethical-religious sense—the noble side of men and of nations."

BRIEF PEACE NOTES

ON November 7 was announced the arrival at a British port of Colonel House, head of the special commission which is to represent this country in the Inter-Allied Conference. Accompanying Colonel House are Admiral W. S. Benson, Chief of Naval Operations; Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, Chief of Staff, United States Army; Oscar T. Crosby, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; Vance C. McCormick, Chairman of the War Trade Board; Bainbridge Colby, United States Shipping Board; Dr. Alonzo E. Taylor, representing the Food Controller; Thomas Nelson Perkins, representing the Priority Board; and Gordon Auchincloss, as secretary. Mr. Crosby and Mr. McCormick are members of the American Peace Society.

. . . The words of the Hon. C. T. Wang, Vice-President of the Chinese Senate, cast some light upon the significance of the agreement recently entered into by the United States Department of State and the Japanese Special Mission headed by Viscount Ishii, as well as upon the formal protest of the Chinese Government, which followed. They are quoted from an article by the Rev. W. Reginald Wheeler (formerly a fellow-student of Mr. Wang at Yale University) in *The New York Times Current History* for November:

With the strongly ingrained love for democracy and the firm belief in the necessity of subordinating military authority under the civil, in the character of our people, we do not hesitate for a minute to affirm that in China, just as it is in free and democratic nations of the world, constitution-

alism shall prevail over militarism. We, like the Entente Allies, have time on our side. We shall have to make the same sacrifices for the final victory of constitutionalism and democracy as they are making in their titanic struggle on the battlefield of Europe. Let us resolve that we will.

In this vital struggle where shall America, the champion of democracy, stand? We entirely agree with Mr. Milliard in his views expressed through the editorial columns of his paper [*Milliard's Review*] on July 28, which we will reproduce here for emphasis:

"A primary requisite is that, as between reversion to an archaic monarchy, or the retention of a military oligarchy, or a graduated advance toward genuine republicanism, the influence of the United States ought to be thrown definitely to bring about the last-named. *If this leads to quasi-interference with Chinese politics, then that responsibility must be faced.* [The italics are our own—Eds.] It is becoming rather ridiculous, at a time when America is engaged in a world war, when the whole life of the American people is being readjusted to meet these war conditions, and with the avowed principal object of saving democratic principles of government from being smothered by autocratic militarism, that the power and influence of the United States should be applied in one place abroad, and should not be applied in another place abroad; that direct American assistance should be accorded to some nations that are trying to cast off the yoke of autocracy and be denied to other nations that are making the same office."

At any rate, neither France nor Great Britain, we take it, would raise any objection to America giving substantial aid to China. By process of elimination, Japan is the only power left whose attitude is doubtful. Will she object or will she not if the United States renews her open-door policy? If she objects, and does not wish China to grow strong and united and to establish and develop liberal and democratic institutions, then, as Mr. Milliard puts it, "It is very important for China to know it, and for the United States to know it." In view of the repeated assurance given both by the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Japanese press, we are rather persuaded that if the United States renews the open-door policy at this juncture Japan is likely to fall in with it.

Mr. Wang adds a second and third suggestion for assistance to his country that can well be rendered by the United States. These are money and industrial experts.

. . . From the same magazine we take the following singularly clear exposition of the German meaning in the stipulation they have made for "freedom of the seas." As they have too plainly said, they do not mean that freedom to trade around the world which Great Britain has, with her navy, guaranteed to all the nations of the world these many years past. What they do mean, as here given by Count zu Reventlow, at a public meeting in Berlin in March, 1917, in a paper which, there is every reason to believe, was carefully censored by governmental authorities, is "another story," as we see:

What do we Germans understand by the freedom of the seas? Of course, we do not mean by it that free use of the sea which is the common privilege of all nations in times of peace—the right to the open highways of international trade. That sort of freedom of the sea we had before the war. What we understand today by this doctrine is that Germany should possess such maritime territories and such naval bases that at the outbreak of a war we should be able, with our navy ready, reasonably to guarantee ourselves the command of the seas. We want such a jumping-off place for our navy as would give us a fair chance of dominating the seas and of being free of the seas during a war. [Cheers.] The inalienable possession of the Belgian seaboard is therefore a matter of life and death to us, and the man is a traitor who would faint-heartedly relinquish this coast to England. Our aim must be not only to keep what

our arms have already won on this coast, but sooner or later to extend our seaboard to the south of the Strait of Calais.

. . . Stating that our Allies look to us to make up the 220,000,000 bushel shortage in the wheat crop, of which we would normally be able to supply but 88,000,000, the United States Food Administration issues this appeal to the individual consumer who would render patriotic service to his country:

There are 100,000,000 of us using an average of five pounds of wheat flour a week per person. If you, by the hundred million, use only four pounds a week—one pound less—we can ship those 132,000,000 other bushels of wheat that are now lacking. And your pound is easily saved:

By having one wheatless meal a day—more, if you can—eating rye bread, corn bread, barley bread, and other kinds, instead of wheat bread, and by serving less pie and cake.

By ordering your bread a day in advance; then the baker will not bake too much and have it go stale.

By cutting the loaf on the table as each slice is needed; then none will go stale.

By making into puddings or toasting every crust or piece that does go stale.

You are the guard over the soldier's ration; he will attend to the enemy.

. . . The President's word to the people anent the work of the Food Administration is in part as follows:

To provide an adequate supply of food both for our own soldiers on the other side of the seas and for the civil populations and the armies of the Allies is one of our first and foremost obligations, for if we are to maintain their constancy in this struggle for the independence of all nations we must first maintain their health and strength. The solution of our food problems, therefore, is dependent upon the individual service of every man, woman, and child in the United States. The great voluntary effort in this direction which has been initiated and organized by the Food Administration under my direction offers an opportunity of service in the war which is open to every individual and by which every individual may serve both his own people and the peoples of the world.

We cannot accomplish our objects in this great war without sacrifice and devotion, and in no direction can that sacrifice and devotion be shown more than by each home and public eating-place in the country pledging its support to the Food Administration and complying with its requests.

. . . Before the counter revolution in Russia set the country in renewed confusion, M. Noulens, French Ambassador to Russia, uttered a warning to his people to beware of such results of German intrigue in the new republic. German propagandists were endeavoring, he declared, to arouse suspicion in Russia toward the other Allies, with the evident purpose of tricking the new government into negotiating concessions to Germany, or, failing this, to sow the seeds of division in the ranks of the Allies. Speaking for his fellow-countrymen, as to their proper attitude at this time, he said:

We want the peace of tomorrow to enable everybody to be left free to live freely, and to give humanity the opportunity of developing its moral and material patrimony. It is because the German peace does not present these guarantees that we refuse to reply to the tortuous offers that may be made to us. As confident in our Allies as we are in ourselves, we shall never consent to negotiate at Russia's expense. She can feel certain that on the day when peace is concluded, her interests will be safeguarded as well as ours. The press must be sufficiently clear-sighted to warn public opinion against the perfidious insinuations of German propaganda.

. . . A resolution recently introduced in the British House of Commons brought forth much enlightening comment on the purposes of the leaders of that nation. The resolution provided that, if satisfactory guarantees could be obtained for the independence and restoration of Belgium and the evacuation of other occupied territory, no obstacles should be placed before the preliminaries toward negotiations for a peace settlement which should embody an equitable solution of the Alsace-Lorraine problem and the devising of effective international machinery for averting future wars. Mr. Lees-Smith, who proposed the resolution, held that public and secret agreements between the Allies had gradually added to the original purpose of the war until it had lost its original character entirely. He instanced schemes for a commercial boycott of the Central Empires, agreements to give Russia Constantinople, for a French empire in Assyria, the carving of Asia Minor between France, Britain, Italy and Russia, and to take from Germany tracts of territory west of the Rhine, including the whole of the Saar Valley. Upon Mr. Lambert's, the seconder, warning that the Allies must make up their minds to welcome Germany to the league of nations with open arms, a considerable uproar of "Nos" and "Nevers" is said to have broken forth. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, also supporting the resolution, declared that to restore Alsace-Lorraine to France would be "to hand her the poison cup of future trouble." Mr. A. J. Balfour denied vigorously all statements of secret treaties with France in regard to the left bank of the Rhine. Mr. Asquith supported Mr. Balfour in stating that, whereas the Allies' aims were unchanged and clearly stated, Germany's were still in doubt, and that the fate of Poland and Armenia, as well as of many other peoples, was quite as necessary a matter of preliminary agreement before a conference was possible, as was that of Alsace or Belgium.

. . . Declaring false certain South American assertions that the Allies are planning an economic offensive against the Central Powers after peace is declared, Lord Robert Cecil, British Minister of Blockade, explained the fundamental facts from which such conclusions are deduced, thus:

It is becoming daily more evident that after the war the Entente Allies will have to apportion raw materials with care, and will have to satisfy first their own needs, and then, if there is a surplus, they will have to consider the needs of neutrals. Only then will they be able to consider the question of allowing the Central Powers to have what remains, if anything remains.

The longer the war lasts the less there will be to go round. That is an inevitable and essential fact of the present situation. These facts, it is evident, do not depend in any way on the Allies' desire to use their power. The economic position of the Central Powers is, therefore, very precarious, and if the war goes on, I can see no prospect of anything but disaster for them after the war.

. . . At the opening of the British War Savings Fund campaign, at Albert Hall, in London, last month, Premier Lloyd-George declared that the ten, twenty or thirty years that would follow any peace which was less than a conclusive peace would breed destructive powers of unthinkable horror and magnitude. "We must settle

this once for all," he asserted, "or many of you here will live to see civilization perish on the earth." Regarding present peace prospects, he said:

The way to shorten the war is to prepare as if the struggle were going to be a long one. I am not going to predict when the end of the war will come; no man in his senses would prolong it one hour if there were an opportunity for real and lasting peace. *But it must be a lasting peace.* It must not be a peace which would be the prelude to a new and more devastating war.

I have been scanning the horizon, and cannot see any terms in sight which would lead to an enduring peace. I feel that the only terms which are possible now would be terms which would end in an armed truce. I will say an armed truce ending in an even more frightful struggle. This war is terrible beyond all. But terrible as it is in itself, it is still more terrible in the possibilities which it has revealed of new horrors on land and sea and in the air.

. . . At a war meeting in Sheffield, England, recently, General Smuts advocated a new variant of the "scrap of paper." He declared there to be but one great common war aim, the end of militarism, and added:

We cannot make peace until the German war map becomes a "scrap of paper." We cannot make peace while Germany sits with the fruits of her sin. She planned this deed of shame against Europe; she schemed in the dark and prepared. Germany must realize that this thing must not be. Her previous wars had paid handsome dividends, but she must learn her lesson at last. She must not retain an inch of her war map at the end of the war. Let the Allies' motto be, "No spoils to spoliators."

. . . The Vatican's interest in preventing a union of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs into one nation is made clear by a writer in *Unità*, of Rome. While Russia's Holy Synod was encouraging a union between the Catholic Slovenes and Croats which excluded orthodox Serbia, the Vatican was content. But a free Russia, with freedom of religion, raising no bar to the inclusion of the Serbs, is a disturbing factor. These two strong Catholic peoples, says the writer, divorced from clerical Austria and united with orthodox and schismatic Serbia, would be far from pleasing to the clericals at Rome. He claims this to be the explanation of clerical opposition to Italy's joining in the war in 1915, and of the Vatican's subsequent support of proposals to conquer the whole of the Adriatic. In either case, the writer holds, "they hoped in this way to bring about an irreconcilable division between Italy and Slavia and to make Italian nationalism their ally against the Slav national movement, and to save Austria, the bulwark of the church."

. . . The famous German Reichstag peace resolution adopted by the majority parties in July last has only recently been made public in its entirety. It runs as follows:

As on August 4, 1914, so on the threshold of the fourth year of war, the declaration of the Speech from the Throne: "We are actuated by no lust for conquest," still holds good for the German people. For the defense of her freedom and independence, for the integrity of her territorial possessions (*Besitzstand*) did Germany resort to arms.

The Reichstag seeks a peace by agreement, and the permanent reconciliation of the nations. With such a peace, forcible acquisitions of territory and political, economic, or financial outrages are irreconcilable.

The Reichstag also rejects all schemes based on an economic isolation and rivalry (*Verfeindung*) of the nations after the war. The freedom of the seas must be secured.

Economic peace alone will prepare the ground for the peoples to live together in amity.

The Reichstag will energetically promote the creation of international judicial organizations.

So long, however, as the enemy governments do not agree to such a peace, so long as they threaten Germany and her allies with conquest and outrage, the German people will stand together as one man, will endure unshaken, and will fight until the right of itself and its allies to life and development is secured.

In its unity the German people is invincible. The Reichstag knows itself to be one in this with the men who in the most heroic warfare are defending the fatherland. The imperishable gratitude of the whole German people is assured them.

. . . The resolution for the formation of a society of nations, passed by the National Convention of Radicals and Radical Socialists, meeting in Paris the last week in October, runs as follows:

Resolved, that a treaty of peace that closes the war must establish a society of nations into which may enter all those capable of contracting valid agreements, even those with a minimum of democratic institutions. The engagements shall respect and make respected the equal rights of little and great nations;

That a world federation of the peoples may establish and maintain peace in the world if it is armed with the three powers, legislative, judicial, and executive, which will permit it to substitute finally the force of right for the right of force;

To require of all contracting nations submission to the laws and decisions of the international public authority and to institute finally, by grace of the force of all placed at the service of each, penalties sufficiently drastic to prevent or repress all violations of the international constitution or any aggression from outside its domain.

. . . That Armenia left under Turkish domination after the war would result in the imperiling of future peace in Europe, and that no mere reforms, but freedom only, will prevent that danger, is the declaration of the Delegation Nationale Arménienne, which met in Paris in the latter part of October. In the Delegation's statement on "The Armenian question and the Peace Congress" it is declared that Russian freedom brings to the fore the one solution of Armenia's fate compatible with the victory of democracy, "the constitution of an autonomous Armenia, composed exclusively of the Armenian territories of the Ottoman Empire." No territory is asked of Russia or Persia, but of Turkey only. This would include the present provinces of Erzeroum, Bitlis, Van, Diarbékir, Mamouretul-Aziz, and Sivas, with Cilicia, and the ports of Mersina, Alexandretta, and Trébizonde thrown in. "The autonomous Armenia thus created would be under the protectorate of the powers." This is intended to mean a collective protectorate, tantamount to neutralization. It is pointed out that such a State would be both a buffer between Turkey and Russia, Persia, Mesopotamia, and Syria, and a means of controlling absolutely the activities of the Bagdad Railway. Armenia would remain under the direct trusteeship of one of the protecting powers for a term of twenty-five years, or thereabouts, to be terminated "when financial, economical, administrative, and political stability is realized," as in Cuba and the Philippines. It is asserted that there are now one and a half millions of native Armenians alive, despite the Turkish massacres, and it is pointed out that this is over three times the number of Greeks in Greece at the time that country secured its freedom.

... "We have been asked to state our war aims and the nature of our peace conditions," said M. Ribot, French Minister for Foreign Affairs, recently before the Chamber of Deputies. "As has been eloquently said at a previous sitting, we did not enter this struggle with war aims." He continued, in part:

For forty-five years, in spite of the unhealed wound in our side, we had desired peace, and today, after all these hecatombs, after all the sacrifices of French lives which have followed the unjust provocation of which we were the victims, what is it that we require? I answered that question not without a certain pride, and, I hope, precision, a few years ago. What I said, gentlemen, was this: We want justice, and nothing more.

France does not want conquests; she will do violence to no people. When we demand the restitution of Alsace-Lorraine, what do we declare to the world? We tell them this: We are the champions of violated right. We have been the victims, and we ask the whole world to be one with us in making this just peace which we demand a durable peace, by the necessary preliminary action of blotting out the injustice which was committed forty-five years ago, and which for forty-five years has lain heavily on us. If that condition is not complied with, then nothing is accomplished. It would simply mean a truce of a few years' duration.

I have also added: the restitution of Alsace-Lorraine does not suffice; we must have reparations. I said, just as the President of the United States said, it is not vengeance which we demand, it is not a penalty which we wish to inflict on those who yet have violated all human laws and torn up all the documents to which they had affixed their signature; what we want is right and justice. It is not an indemnity which we wish to inflict on our beaten foes; it is the reparation of the criminal destructions which they have committed. And I also said—and I think we are unanimous on the subject—that we should want guarantees. We are not going to sign a peace which will oblige us or our children once more to run to arms. And I also say, as the President of the United States has said: "What would be the value of the signature of those who govern in Germany at the present time, if, backing that signature, there is not the very firm, the very unmistakable will of the German people itself?"

... Attempting with pathetic earnestness to solve the problem, "Why have almost all the nations, whose friendship we sincerely desired, become our enemies?" the Berlin *Vorwaerts*, the great German Socialist daily, arrived at the conclusion that it is due to the fact that, owing to the constant struggle for supremacy on the part of various factions in Germany, the foreign policy of that government has not been firm enough, and, therefore, has been constantly misunderstood. It continues:

The German situation is a choice of either absolutism or parliamentary reform. This condition cannot continue to exist. As it is, we have an Emperor, who, according to the constitution, has the power to conclude peace; a Chancellor, who brooks no interference in carrying out his plans, but has no idea of foreign affairs; a Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who is merely an assistant to the Imperial Chancellor; a Reichstag, which decides upon a peace program, and a parliamentary Council of Seven, which reviews and passes upon diplomatic notes. It is evident that the most important factors which bear upon our foreign affairs have not even been mentioned above. Should this state of affairs continue to exist?

This situation must be cleared up, and the Reichstag should begin its duties along this line when it convenes.

... "Ideas can be defeated only by ideas, and never by howitzers and torpedoes," is the lonely cry of Maximilian Harden in a recent issue of *Die Zukunft*, speaking of the futility of the Stockholm Socialist Conference. "In-

stead of dreaming of a Stockholm miracle, think out a word-picture which will win souls for a peace in the making of which Germany will have her share. Miracles only happen when love in its holy strength is fructified by the creative spirit of humanity."

... A curious echo to the above is heard in the words of the American economist and statistician, Roger W. Babson, spoken recently before the Industrial Trade Conference: "Peace cannot be enforced. The world will never be safe for democracy until the economic causes of war are eliminated. Military autocracy cannot be destroyed until commercial and industrial autocracy are destroyed also."

... "I should like to see a budget of millions—yes, billions—provided after the war for the cultivation of international fellowship," says Bruce Barton, outspoken editor of *Every Week*. He proposes this venture as a remedy for the "vicious circle" of competing armaments, and continues:

We might as well speak right out plainly on this matter. And the plain truth is that every people in the world has certain peculiar attributes that grate on the nerves of any other people.

I myself am a direct descendant of the British Isles. As far back as I can trace, my people have been English or Scotch or Irish.

Yet there are few human experiences that can so effectively irritate me as a short conversation with the average Englishman.

Doubtless I grate on him as much as he on me; doubtless there are certain traits of mine that simply set a German or a Japanese on edge.

It is not enough that we should merely agree not to keep a gun pointed at each other's head. The thing for us to do is to spend some time and money every year getting to know each other better—in laying so broad and deep a foundation of mutual respect that the trivialities of character that divide us will appear as trivialities indeed.

I would see an enormous international exchange of teachers and students after the war.

I would bring a group of young newspaper men from every foreign country every year to work in our newspaper offices, and send hundreds of our newspaper men to other lands. The press, the great mold of public opinion, should have at its helm men who understand and appreciate the other fellow's point of view.

All this, of course, will cost money; and we shall be more likely to value it for that reason.

The gods, as Emerson says, sell everything to men at a fair price.

At a price of three billions a year for war preparation, they have sold us the most frightful war in history.

At what price—when the war is over—can we buy a few hundred years of peace?

... A budget of \$4,000,000 has been prepared by the National Young Women's Christian Association War Council for work greatly needed in behalf of women and girls in the war zone and in the training-camp zones in America, where many girls and women are employed in telephone offices, shops, and the like. Practically the whole of the million dollars appropriated in this budget for "work in other countries" is to be used in France and Russia for American nurses and the dependent women and girls of the various centers of war activity. The budget entire is as follows:

To cover:

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Hostess houses requested..... | \$900,000 |
| 2. Emergency housing for the employed girl
(possibly 10 centers)..... | 500,000 |

Camp and industrial centers:

3. Work in other countries.....	1,000,000
4. Increased staff:	
Headquarters war work.....	\$50,000
Industrial centers (10 possibly) ..	125,000
Hostess houses and other centers	250,000
Recreation and Girls' Workers	
Local Associations	50,000
Traveling expenses	50,000
	525,000
5. Foreign community work.....	100,000
6. National Board (headquarters and field)...	270,000
7. Junior War Council, Patriotic League.....	50,000
8. Publicity, including Magazine Patriotic League	100,000
9. Bureau of Social Morality Speakers.....	100,000
10. Work in colored communities affected by the war	200,000
11. Emergency and miscellaneous.....	255,000
	<hr/> \$4,000,000

... Russia's need and the service we may render was the subject of an interview recently given to the press by Dr. Frank Billings, of Chicago, just back from Russia, where he was head of the American Red Cross Special Commission. He said:

Russia's greatest need today is sincere friendship from the outside. In her struggle for a constitutional and democratic form of government, America can be of immense service, not so much in the way of gifts of money, but by letting the people of Russia know what is going on in this country, and what the United States is doing in the war. Russia is without any American news that is worth while. Most of what they hear about the United States in the war comes to them through pro-German propaganda, and is to the effect that this country is fighting for pecuniary gain; that the United States is a vassal of England, and that England wants to rule the world. They have not heard a word of President Wilson's reasons why we are in this war.

However, America is looked to by the Russians as their best friend.

... What is termed "The Acid Test" is submitted by the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief, 1 Madison avenue, New York City, in the form of a Workers' Bulletin, No. 7. Attention is here called to the fact that the channels for relief of these Eastern peoples is open, and that thus Americans have it in their power to save life as truly as if a child or helpless grown person were dying on their own doorsteps. Says this Bulletin further:

We refrain from repeating in this bulletin the more extended cablegrams, on the basis of which, supplemented by the reports of eye witnesses, the following official minimum estimate was made of the number of destitute in the various fields dependent upon this committee:

Region.	Total number destitute.	Of whom orphans.
Asia Minor	500,000	200,000
Syria (including Palestine) ..	1,200,000	75,000
Caucasus	350,000	100,000
Persia	90,000	25,000
Egypt
Southern Mesopotamia
Totals	2,140,000	400,000

Since the above estimate was made, official reports indicating that as many as 700,000 Greeks alone have been deported in Asia Minor, would not only indicate that the above estimate of 500,000 of all nationalities, including Armenians, was conservative, but that the total for all the fields is probably nearer 3,000,000 than 2,000,000, and that the total estimate of \$30,000,000 needed is conservative.

A course of eleven lectures on "Current Developments in World Politics" is being given in New York City by Norman Angell and Emily Greene Balch. Miss Balch is giving the first eight lectures and Mr. Angell the three concluding ones. Five different series are being held: Wednesday evenings at 8 o'clock; Tuesday afternoons at 3:30, and Saturday mornings at 11 in the Hotel McAlpin; Friday afternoons at 3:30 in the Women's Club, 114 Pierrepont street, Brooklyn, and Friday evenings at 8 in the McKinley Square Casino, 779 East One Hundred and Sixty-ninth street, the Bronx. "To meet the constantly increasing demand for an interpretation of events in world politics and to further the political education of those who feel the responsibility of America's new international rôle," are set forth in the program as the purpose of the course.

The New England Director of the American Peace Society, Dr. James L. Tryon, announces that engagements may now be made outside of New England for any or all of his various lectures. These lectures have been delivered with great success before church, school, and social organizations in all the New England States. Several of his lectures are illustrated with stereopticon views. Arrangements for these lectures may be made with Dr. Tryon direct, at his headquarters, 95 Exchange street, Portland, Maine, or through the national headquarters of the American Peace Society, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

AMONG THE PEACE ORGANIZATIONS

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

New England Department

SPEAKING before the College Club, which met at the home of Bishop Brewster, in Portland, November 7th, Director Tryon, in referring to the friendship of the English-speaking peoples, the subject upon which he was lecturing, said: "The strongest tie between our two peoples is not that of blood, but of language and literature, and a common conception of law and government. They can appeal to each other and work together on principles which they both recognize and respect. That is why they see eye to eye in this war and why they are today fighting for democracy on the battle-grounds of Europe." Dr. Tryon has recently spoken at Parsons Field Seminary, Porter and Cornish High Schools and Brighton Academy, Me., as well as before the Whitefield and Littleton High Schools and the Red Cross of Bethlehem, where he contributed his services for the benefit of the relief fund. He spoke twice at the Congregational Church at North Conway, New Hampshire. His engagements in the vicinity of Portland included the Portland Equal Franchise League, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, Stroudwater, and Bethany Congregational Church, South Portland.

South Atlantic States Department

With the advice and co-operation of the leaders in his field, the Director has recently sent out a letter to all friends of internationalism in that district, urging